

Remarks/Arguments:

In response to the various paragraphs of the Office Action, applicants offer the following remarks.

Title:

In response to the Office Action, applicants have now provided a new title that is more descriptive of the invention.

Allowable Subject Matter:

At page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 9-11 would be allowable, if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response applicants have now amended **claim 1** to include the feature of claim 9. As noted in the Office Action, a feature of claim 9 that is considered allowable is the "**insulating layer**" that separates the output surface of the MCP and the electron receiving surface of the solid state imaging sensor. This is shown as insulating spacer 55 in FIG. 4B, for example. The Examiner notes that this feature is not suggested by the prior art.

Claims 2-8 and 10-19 (claim 9 is canceled) depend from now allowable amended claim 1 and are, therefore, also allowable.

Section 102 Rejections:

Claim 20 has been rejected as being anticipated by Ng. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome for reasons set forth below.

Amended claim 20 now includes features that are not suggested by the cited reference, namely:

- an **insulating layer** separating an output surface of the microchannel plate and an electron receiving surface of the solid-state imaging sensor.

As noted above, the **insulating layer** that separates the output surface of the MCP and the electron receiving surface of the solid state imaging sensor is not disclosed or suggested by the prior art. Favorable reconsideration is requested for amended claim 20.

Section 103 Rejections:

Claim 21 has been rejected as being obvious in view of Estrera. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is overcome for the reasons set forth below.

Amended claim 21 now includes features, which are not suggested by the cited references, namely:

- an **insulating layer** separating an output surface of the electron multiplying device and an electron receiving surface of the solid-state image sensor.

As noted above, the **insulating layer** separating the output surface of the electron multiplying device and the electron receiving surface of the solid-state image sensor is not disclosed by the cited references. Favorable reconsideration is requested for amended claim 21.

Newly Added Claim:

Claim 22 is newly added. The CMOS imager of claim 22 includes features similar to claim 21. Basis for the CMOS imager may be found, for example, at page 5, lines 11-15, for example. As stated therein, one alternative to an image intensifier is the electron bombarded CCD/CMOS sensor. The CMOS imager includes a photo cathode, and a body envelope of the image tube and a CMOS sensor integrated into this envelope.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-8, 10-21 are now in condition for allowance.

Newly added claim 22 is also in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Jack J. Jankovitz, Reg. No. 42,690
Attorney for Applicants

JJJ/mc

Dated: June 16, 2003

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

June 16, 2003

